

**MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS  
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL #09-008-ACCD  
ADDENDUM #1**

**September 2, 2008**

**RFP NO.: 09-008-ACCD  
TO BE OPENED: October 15, 2008  
TITLE: Residential Sex Offender Treatment Program**

To All Offerors:

Attached are written questions received in response to this RFP. These questions, along with the Department's response, become an official amendment to this RFP.

All other terms of the subject "Request for Proposal" are to remain as previously stated.

**Acknowledgment of Addendum:**

The offeror for this solicitation must acknowledge receipt of this addendum. This page must be submitted at the time set for the proposal opening or the proposal may be disqualified from further consideration.

I acknowledge receipt of Addendum #1.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Company Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Sincerely,

Gary Willems, Contracts Manager

## QUESTIONS/RESPONSES DUE AUGUST 26, 2008.

**The Department of Corrections did not receive any questions regarding the Residential Sex Offender Treatment Program identified in RFP 09-008-ACCD.**

Therefore, the only item addressed by this amendment is the inclusion of the specific point values assigned to each section/sub-section as identified in Section 6.0 of the original RFP. Please note that the Department has modified the point values assigned in the original evaluation schedule and those changes are reflected in the evaluation schedule listed below.

### SECTION 6: EVALUATION PROCESS

#### **6.0 BASIS OF EVALUATION**

The evaluation committee will review and evaluate the offers according to the following criteria based on a **total number of 3,500 points**.

Offers will be evaluated based on the following Scoring Guide. Any firm receiving a "fail" will be eliminated from further consideration.

**Any response that fails to achieve a passing score per the requirements of Section 2.3.5 will be eliminated from further consideration. A "fail" for any individual evaluation criteria may result in proposal disqualification at the discretion of the procurement officer.**

#### **SCORING GUIDE**

In awarding points to the evaluation criteria, the evaluator/evaluation committee will consider the following guidelines:

**Superior Response (95-100%):** A superior response is a highly comprehensive, excellent reply that meets all of the requirements of the RFP. In addition, the response covers areas not originally addressed within the RFP and includes additional information and recommendations that would prove both valuable and beneficial to the State of Montana.

**Good Response (85-94%):** A good response meets all the requirements of the RFP and demonstrates in a clear and concise manner a thorough knowledge and understanding of the project, with no deficiencies noted.

**Fair Response (60-84%):** A fair response minimally meets most requirements set forth in the RFP. The offeror demonstrates some ability to comply with guidelines and requirements of the project, but knowledge of the subject matter is limited.

**Failed Response (0-59%):** A failed response does not meet the requirements set forth in the RFP. The offeror has not demonstrated sufficient knowledge of the subject matter.

## 6.1 EVALUATION CRITERIA

Scope of Project		70% of points for a possible 2,450 points	
Category	Section of RFP	Point Value	
<b>A. Scope Requirements</b>		<b>(170)</b>	
1) Goals and Performance measures	3.1	60	
2) Sentencing	3.2	Pass/Fail	
3) History	3.3	Pass/Fail	
4) Treatment	3.4	Not Scored	
5) Alcohol & Drug Testing	3.8	20	
6) Offender Files	3.9.1, 3.9.2, 3.9.3	Pass/Fail	
7) Transportation	3.10	Pass/Fail	
8) Returned Custody	3.11	Pass/Fail	
9) Safety	3.13	10	
10) Work Stoppages	3.14	10	
11) Disasters	3.15	10	
12) Offender Absence/Escape	3.16	10	
13) Unlawful/Suspicious Behavior	3.17	Pass/Fail	
14) Supervision	3.18	Not Scored	
15) Laundry	3.19	10	
16) Food Services	3.20	30	
17) Accountability	3.21	Pass/Fail	
18) Assumed Control	3.23	Pass/Fail	
19) Religious Activities	3.24	10	
20) Offender Rights	3.25	Pass/Fail	
21) Offender Telephones/Commissions	3.26	Pass/Fail	
22) Offender Commissary/Canteen	3.27	Pass/Fail	
23) Fiscal Management/Reporting	3.28.1, 3.28.2, 3.28.3	Pass/Fail	
24) Offender Discharge	3.29	Pass/Fail	
25) Compliance	3.30	Pass/Fail	
26) Information Technology	3.31	Pass/Fail	
27) Offender Property	3.32	Pass/Fail	
28) Subcontractors	3.34	Pass/Fail	
29) Visitations	3.35	Pass/Fail	
<b>B. Siting</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>Pass/Fail</b>	
<b>C. Program Requirements</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>(1,150)</b>	
1) Operational Date/General	3.6.1	Pass/Fail	
2) Confidentiality	3.6.2	Pass/Fail	
3) Target Population	3.6.3	Pass/Fail	
4) Program Description	3.6.4	100	
5) Program Guidelines & Principles	3.6.5	100	
6) Program Structure and Content	3.6.6	100	
7) Schedules	3.6.7	100	
8) Program Screening	3.6.8	50	
9) Program Intake/Assessment	3.6.9.1	100	
10) Treatment Planning	3.6.9.2	100	
11) Discharge Planning	3.6.9.3	100	
12) Required Program Phases	3.6.10		
Phase I – Orientation	3.6.10.1	100	
Phase II – Sexual Offending Education & TX	3.6.10.2	100	
Phase III – Relapse prevention & Re-Entry	3.6.10.3	100	
13) Program Progression and Failure	3.6.11	50	
14) Program Evaluation	3.6.12		

	Structure	3.6.12.1	25
	Process	3.6.12.2	25
	Outcomes	3.6.12.3	25
	Compliance	3.6.12.4	Pass/Fail
	Incentives and Sanctions	3.6.12.5	25
<b>D.</b>	<b>Health Services</b>	<b>3.7(all)</b>	<b>250</b>
<b>E.</b>	<b>Facility Conditions</b>	<b>3.12(all)</b>	<b>Pass/Fail</b>
<b>F.</b>	<b>Agency Security Regulations</b>	<b>3.22</b>	<b>(80)</b>
	1) Security Policies	3.22.1	20
	2) Incident Management	3.22.2	20
	3) Contingency Plan	3.22.3	Pass/Fail
	4) Offender Movement	3.22.4	20
	5) Plan Review	3.22.5	Pass/Fail
	6) Use of Force	3.22.6	20
<b>G.</b>	<b>Program Staffing</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>(800)</b>
	1) Selection	3.33.1	Pass/Fail
	2) Licensure/Certifications	3.33.2	300
	3) Additional Qualifications	3.33.3	30
	4) Staffing Patterns	3.33.4	120
	5) Submission of Staffing Plan	3.33.5	Pass/Fail
	6) Staff Training	3.33.6	120
	7) Background Staff Investigations	3.33.7	Pass/Fail
	8) Staff Recruitment and Hiring Practices	3.33.8	30
	9) Method of Providing Services	4.1.3	200

<b>Offeror Qualifications</b>		<b>15% of points for a possible 525 points</b>	
<b>Category</b>	<b>Section of RFP</b>	<b>Point Value</b>	
<b>H. Offeror Qualifications</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>(525)</b>	
1) References	4.1.1	100	
2) Years of Experience	4.1.2	50	
3) Past Projects	4.1.2	100	
4) Staff Qualifications	4.1.2	275	
5) Offeror Financial Stability	4.1.4	Pass/Fail	

<b>Cost Proposal</b>		<b>15% of points for a possible 525 points</b>	
<b>Category</b>	<b>Section of RFP</b>	<b>Point Value</b>	
<b>I. Cost Proposal</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>525</b>	

Lowest overall cost receives the maximum allotted points. All other proposals receive a percentage of the points available based on their cost relationship to the lowest. Example: Total possible points for cost are 30. Offeror A's cost is \$20,000. Offeror B's cost is \$30,000. Offeror A would receive 30 points, Offeror B would receive 20 points ( $\$20,000/\$30,000 = 67\% \times 30 \text{ points} = 20$ ).

$$\frac{\text{Lowest Responsive Offer Total Cost}}{\text{This Offeror's Total Cost}} \times \text{Number of available points} = \text{Award Points}$$

MDOC will evaluate the proposed pricing methodologies to determine the method most advantageous to the State of Montana (i.e., the most advantageous offer for (A) and the most advantageous offer for (B) will be evaluated against the most advantageous offer for (C) to make this determination).